

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay. The examiner has indicated that the case contains allowable subject matter.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added. In addition the Abstract has been replaced.

The claims have been replaced with a set of US-style claims based on a new claim 12 that describes, as shown in the drawing, a withdrawing device used in combination with a press 2 that outputs an elongated workpiece 3 in a direction L, a withdrawing device comprising:

- a first guide 11 extending in the direction L;
- a first carriage 4 displaceable in the direction L along the first guide 11;
- first motor means 12 for displacing the first carriage 4 in the direction L along the first guide 11;
- a second guide 15 extending in the direction L on the first carriage 4;
- a second carriage 5 displaceable in the direction L on the second guide 15, whereby the second

carriage 5 can move relative to the first carriage 4;  
means for clamping the workpiece 3 to the second carriage 5;  
second motor means 7 separate from the first motor means 12 for displacing the second carriage 5 on the second guide 15; and  
control means 10 connected to the first motor means 12 and to the second motor means 7 for shifting the second carriage 5 in the direction L at a speed independent of a speed of the first carriage 4 while the first carriage 4 is moving in the direction L.

Such a system allows the traction force applied to the workpiece to be controlled very accurately. The problems of the prior art, largely caused by trying to control the speed of a massive single carriage, are wholly avoided with the dual-carriage system of this invention with independent speed control. The second carriage is moved while the first carriage is moving so that its movement can be added to or subtracted from that of the second carriage.

The admitted state of the prior art is shown in US 2,940,119 of Perrault. Here a single carriage is used to pull a length of pipe out of a mold. This reference clearly does not all alone anticipate the instant invention.

US patent 1,821,128 of Weir, which predates the Perrault patent by some 29 years, shows where a first carriage 2 carries a second carriage 13. Here, however, the first and second carriages never move at the same time. Instead, the first carriage 2 is moved into position to insert its rails 5 into a kiln, whereupon it is stopped. Then the second carriage 13 is advanced to grab the pipe P, then is retracted to pull it out of the kiln. This is a different control system from that described in new claim 12. In addition in Weir there is a single motor means for controlling the movements of the two carriages, and in fact this motor means seems to be set up such that only one or the other carriage can be moved at a time. No §103 rejection is possible on the combination of Perrault and Weir.

For these reasons all of the claims in the case are felt to be in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



by: Andrew Wilford 26,597  
Attorney for Applicant

19 May 2006  
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900  
Bronx, NY 10471-0900  
Cust. No.: 535  
Tel: (718) 884-6600  
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure:

Substitute Abstract  
Corrected version of translation  
Substitute Specification